

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 8, 2005, was received and carefully noted. A response to the Office Action was timely filed on July 8, 2005. The following remarks are supplemental to the response filed on July 8, 2005. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-19 are pending.

Claim 1 recites wherein the aspect ratio of tensile strength of the base paper is in a range from 5 to 15. The aspect ratio of tensile strength is defined as a ratio of tensile strength in a longitudinal direction or machine direction (MD) to the tensile strength of a cross section (CD). The Applicants respectfully submit that the paper disclosed in Ayers (U.S. Patent No. 3,905,863), Phan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,136,146, "Phan"), Kearney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,225,382, "Kearney"), and Masanori (Japanese Patent Publication No. 10001166, Abstract) have an aspect ratio of 1.5 to 2.5 MD to CD when made by a fourdrinier paper machine and aspect ratio of 3.0 to 4.0 MD to CD when made by a cylinder paper machine. In support of the conventional aspect ratios of paper made by a fourdrinier paper machine and a cylinder paper machine, the Applicants attach herewith a translated portion of "A Story of Paper" by Kazu Yamamoto published in 1977 by Mokujisha, which states:

"ratio of MD and CD of the paper made by a fourdrinier paper machine is 1.5 to 2.5, and ratio of MD and CD of the paper made by a cylinder paper machine is 3.0 to 4.0."

See page 101, lines 8 to 10 of "A Story of Paper". Thus, the Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a paper reticulated structure having an aspect ratio of tensile strength of the base paper of more


than 4.0. As such, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a paper reticulated structure having an aspect ratio of tensile strength of the base paper of from 5 to 15, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, the Applicants submit that Ayers, Phan, Kearney and Masanori, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims, and therefore, do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness for purposes of a rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 108421-00080.**

Respectfully submitted,



Rhonda L. Barton  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 47,271

**Customer No. 004372**

ARENT FOX PLLC

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 638-4810

RLB/wbp

Enclosure: "A Story of Paper, page 101, lines 8 to 10

TECH/316967.1